

Summer 8-26-1987

Senate Meeting August 26, 1987

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting August 26, 1987" (1987). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 525.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/525>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

August 26, 1987

Volume XIV, No. 1

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Seating of New Senators

Roll Call

Minutes of July 15, 1987

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ACTION ITEMS:
1. Election of New Vice Chairperson
Scott J. Williams
 2. Approval of Student Appointments to Honors Council
 3. Approval of A/P Representative to Economic Well
Being Committee

INFORMATION ITEM: Rules Committee Recommendation on Statement of
Politicization

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not approved by the Academic Senate.)

August 26, 1987

Volume XVIV, No. 1

Call to Order

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Seating of New Senators

Mr. Schmaltz introduced three new Academic Senators. John McCarthy from Educational Administration and Foundations will be replacing Ken Strand who is on sabbatical. Ed Kristof, a Junior Social Sciences Teacher Education major, would be replacing David Breuer who was resigning. Charles Sutton, the new Student Regent, a Senior Business & Finance major, would also be joining the Senate.

Roll Call

Secretary Roof called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Minutes of July 15, 1987

Mr. Shulman had a correction on Page 5, third paragraph should read: "15% and 25% reductions,".

XVIV-1

Mr. Belknap moved to approve the Minutes of July 15, 1987 as corrected (Second, Borg). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Schmaltz announced that the President had an excused absence this evening. He read from a letter written by President Watkins: "By this letter I am officially notifying the Senate that there is a vacancy in the position of Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction. Would you please share this information with the Senate on August 26, so that the search process may begin."

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Breuer announced that applications for students on external committees were lacking. Therefore, he urged senators, both faculty and students, and administrators to try to recruit students for these positions. The deadline is Friday, August 28th. Applications can be picked up in the Academic Senate Office. He announced that he was resigning as a Senator and Vice Chairperson due to the fact that he would not be in school this semester.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Meiron had no remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

Provost David Strand addressed three topics. His first topic concerned the Search Committee for the position of Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction. He had asked Dr. Ann Nolte, a member of the Administrative Selection Committee Chairperson Panel (Panel of Ten) to serve as Chair of the Search Committee and Dr. Virginia Owen, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, to serve as Secretary of this Committee. He had communicated this information to Chairperson Schmaltz with a copy of the University Procedure that will now go into place to select the other committee members. He read from this University Procedure for Administrator Selection for Other than College Dean or Department Head: "After the chairperson and secretary have been appointed, the remaining three faculty members shall be elected from a constituency identified by the Administrative Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate in consultation with the Provost." In regard to student representation, "the Academic Senate will elect two students to serve on the committee." Finally, "The Provost may determine that up to two additional members may be added to the committee. The method of selection of such members shall be determined by the Academic Senate upon the recommendation of the Provost." At times a given college has not been represented on the committee, and this allows leeway to choose another faculty representative to even out the distribution. This alternative is also used in placing protected class persons on the committee. The Senate will elect three faculty members and two students, hopefully during the September meetings.

Secondly, he spoke to the issue of Oral English Language Proficiency. At the July meeting of the Senate there was some discussion about some elements of that report, and he had indicated that members of the Senate could raise questions or concerns to him. The document would not be reopened or reconsidered, but expressions of concern were welcomed by the Provost's Office. He had heard from two senators. They asked about Appendix C and some of the language contained in it. Mr. Strand had contacted the Chair of the Committee, Dean Elizabeth Chapman, and she had indicated that the Appendix items were not policy statements, they were included as an historical record for the committee proceedings. Therefore, since they do not have any direct relationship to the policy statement itself, all appendices are being dropped from the report. The report now would consist of the two-page Executive Summary and the five-page report. Another question raised was whether or not the University Review Committee should in fact review this statement for possible approval or possible referencing. It is our feeling that this policy was externally mandated and fits into the category of the affirmative action statement, the equal opportunity statement, the immigration I-9 verification process, and none of these were brought to the attention of the URC. It was their feeling that this report which conforms to a state law does not need to go to the University Review Committee. The responsibility for implementing the oral English proficiency requirement is that of the department chairperson in the role of manager or supervisor of faculty in his department. It is not a charge given to the DFSC. The complaint aspect of the oral English proficiency statement is outside the ASPT process, so that is another reason not to refer this to the University Review Committee.

The third topic is the budget recision and its effect on the academic area. A Provost Office Newsletter distributed today explains this in detail. To briefly summarize what was done, in July when it became apparent that

there was going to be a budget recision, each of the Deans and other administrators in the Provost's area was asked to engage in exercises to reduce the budget from last year by three, four, or five per cent. We found out then that the budget for this year at the University was going to be \$1,568,900 less than the FY 87 budget, in terms of appropriated funds. Since 75% of the appropriated budget is in the academic area, the recision for the academic area amounted to \$1,040,000. At that point we asked the Deans to engage in a 4% reduction exercise to finalize their preliminary work, and submit to the Provost's Office a 4% reduction package. The parameters for determining the final list of budget cuts were four-fold:

1. University and College priorities would be acknowledged, respected and protected as best we could.
2. The impact of the cuts on the fall semester would be minimized.
3. Budget reductions would be applied on a case-by-case basis; with no "across-the-board" cuts being considered.
4. Personal services dollars for summer session salaries of faculty would not be reduced.

We went through this exercise with Dr. Anita Webb-Lupo and Dr. Ed Anderson of the Provost's Office. The cuts ranged from 1% to 10.2% by administrative unit. The heaviest cuts came in the Provost's Office administrative areas, and no college budget was cut more than 4%. As indicated in the newsletter, the Board of Regents at its September meeting is supposed to address the recision problem, and we are hopeful that there will be some sort of exclusion which will probably impact upon students. The students may encounter an unexpected, mid-year tuition increase. We hope that there are other alternatives that can be pursued. It is important that we do something to address the recision, because most of the cuts that we have taken will have a very detrimental impact on the spring semester or summer session offerings of the University.

Mr. Klass asked about the Oral English Language Proficiency report. The Provost stated that this document was externally mandated. He understood that when the Board of Regents voted on the document that the appendices were attached. Since it was externally mandated, he wondered by what authority the appendectomy was conducted. Since the University Review Committee had been excluded, would the Provost also rule that the Academic Affairs Committee could not review this document.

Mr. Strand stated that the state law that required us to have an Oral English Proficiency policy is such that the policy itself is contained in the statement of the Committee and not in the appendices. By deleting the appendices, we are not in any way changing what the Board of Regents approved. The Board of Regents did not approve the appendices. The appendices were provided as supplemental background information, and therefore disassociating the appendices from the body of the report does not in any way change what the Board of Regents did. In regard to whether or not another committee can examine the document itself, a communique from you was referred by the Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee regarding this issue. The Academic Affairs Committee could explore with the Provost's Office the implementation of this policy, might ask the Provost's Office to report at the end of each year on the results of the implementation, may wish to explore with us how the committee reached certain decisions. Opportunities for dialogue still exist.

Mr. Klass asked if this request concerning position announcements was outside the jurisdiction of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Strand stated that he was not a member of the Academic Affairs Committee. When the Executive Committee refers a communique or inquiry to a committee, we are in a different arena for discussion. Mr. Klass said that a judgment had been made previously about the purview of the University Review Committee, was such a judgment to be made about the Academic Affairs Committee? Mr. Strand answered, No.

Mr. Zeidenstein commended the Provost and others who had deleted the Appendices. "No one ever got hurt by having fewer words on paper."

Vice President for Student Affairs, Neal Gamsky, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, Warren Harden, had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election of New Vice Chairperson of the Academic Senate

XVIV-2 Mr. Meiron nominated Scott Williams.

XVIV-3 Mr. Powell nominated Marc Feaster from the floor.

A few senators expressed wishes to have the candidates introduced.

Mr. Feaster asked to speak.

Mr. Shulman said this would be construed as campaigning on the Senate floor.

Mr. Schmaltz said that tradition dictates that the Vice Chairperson be a student.

XVIV-4 Mr. Meiron moved the previous question. (Second, Shulman).

Mr. Schmaltz stated this would require a 2/3 vote of all members present, and would cut off debate.

A roll call vote, 26 in favor, 17 opposed, failed to reach the 2/3 majority. Motion failed.

Mr. O'Rourke suggested the candidates give a statement of their name, department, and major, and year in school.

Mr. Zeidenstein suggested each candidate give a short statement about what they stand for.

Mr. Shulman thought this would be setting a very bad precedent. He thought the candidates should have been chosen at the caucus before the Senate meeting, not at the last minute. There was no reason for a contest on the Senate floor. He was concerned about setting a precedent by having a popularity contest on the Senate floor.

Mr. Gamsky said the normal process was to hold a caucus which chose a nominee for the position. He wondered if the students had not held such a caucus.

Mr. Breuer stated that the students had held a caucus. There were three elections; which tied twice. There was not a full representation of students at this caucus.

Mr. Schmaltz called a ten-minute recess.

Mr. Feaster withdrew his name from nomination.

Vote on Scott Williams as Vice Chairperson of the Senate was unanimous.

2. Approval of Student Appointments to Honors Council

XVIV-5 Motion by Newby (Second, Meiron) to approve the nominations of students to the Honors Council, carried on a voice vote.

Laurie Shirck
Janet Storbeck
Deniel Horn
Mark Ludy
Matthew Farney
Sherri Roos

3. Approval of A/P Representative to the Economic Well Being Committee

XVIV-6 Senate unanimously ratified the appointment of Judy Fish to serve on the Economic Well Being Committee as A/P Representative.

INFORMATION ITEM

1. Rules Committee Recommendation on Statement of Politicization

Mr. Belknap, Chairperson of Rules Committee, introduced the recommendation of his committee on the Statement of Politicization. "The Committee decided that the Zeidenstein revised University Politicization Statement (4.30.87.1) is in agreement with University policies as stated in Articles II and III of the I.S.U. Constitution." The changes included: (1) changing the word politicization to "politicizing the University"; and (2) adding the following new paragraph to the end of the statement: "This resolution need not preclude the taking of institutional positions on issues of public policy which--although narrowly construed--still clearly and directly threaten undesirable changes in the internal operations and policies, budgetary priorities, or academic and other standards and practices of Illinois State University."

Mr. Comadena questioned the Rules Committee Minutes of June 22, 1987, the vote indicated 4 in favor, 1 in opposition, one absent, and one abstaining, which did not add up to the members present at the meeting. Ms. Wojahn, Secretary for the Committee, said at the time of the vote one person had left the meeting. The vote should have included two absent.

Mr. White asked about the meaning of the phrase "institutional position". Could the Senate take a position which is an "institutional position".-- or is it possible for the Senate to take a position which is the Senate's position. If it is possible for the Senate to take a position which is only the Senate's position, then he suggested that the whole document made no sense. He would like an interpretation of what "institutional position" means. This was contained in the Statement on Politicization, last paragraph: "Be it resolved (1) that no representative faculty member, faculty body, officer, or agent of Illinois State University shall take an institutional position on any partisan issue....."

Mr. Belknap stated that one or more than one person could be speaking on behalf of the institution.

Mr. Zeidenstein said if the statements made by the Academic Senate did not constitute "institutional positions", then there are no such things. This is a representative body of the institution Illinois State University. It was clear to him that positions taken by the Academic Senate are statements in which representatives of the University speak for the institution which they represent--which constitutes an "institutional position".

Mr. Shulman thought the President of the University had to approve the actions of the Academic Senate. The chief academic officer of this University is the Provost, not the Senate.

Mr. Schmaltz said that the President of the University does not approve or disapprove of a Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Mr. Shulman said the President does approve "action" by the Academic Senate. He cited communication 7.22.87.1 in the Executive Committee Minutes of 8/19/87 which indicated the President's approval of Academic Senate Action.

Mr. Schmaltz said there is a difference between action items and a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Several years ago when the Senate passed a resolution involving Market Equity and related issues, as a Sense of the Senate Resolution, the President was informed of that. It expressed the will of the majority of the Senate, but, in essence, it goes no where. The President did not approve or disapprove it.

Mr. Zeidenstein did not want his earlier remarks misconstrued as meaning that the Academic Senate was the exclusive spokesperson of the University. Obviously, there is more than one official spokesperson or spokesperson for this institution. The President is clearly one; the Provost is clearly another; and its proper area, the Academic Senate would be a third. The "institutional position" is defined in the last three and a half lines of the 1972 statement: ".....the Academic Senate defines "institutional position" as one on which the University as a community of scholars is represented as having reached a decision for the purpose of influencing society in the resolution of the issue that has polarized it." Any resolution adopted by the Academic Senate would be construed as a decision which represents the entire University community.

Mr. White asked if this statement forbade the President of the University from taking positions on political matters.

Mr. Belknap said if the President of the University were considered as an officer or agent of the institution, then he would presume so. Yes.

Mr. Zeidenstein said that if the President were to speak out as President of the University, he would be included in this statement. If he as a person were to write a letter to the editor, he could speak out in his own right, as other faculty members express their opinions. The distinction is that the President of this University, and any member of this University, faculty, staff, and student has every constitutional first amendment right to say and speak about anything that person wishes. When it comes to the place where one is speaking as if one's personal views represent an entire institution, it is a different matter. He would object to having the President speak in behalf of the institution in a political manner, and indicate that it was an institutional position.

Mr. Strand did not wish to speak for the President, but he felt clarification was needed. What is meant by "partisan issue"? Partisan issue is not defined, so we don't know exactly what we are talking about. If we are talking about democrats vs. republicans, that is one thing, but if we are talking about something in a broader context, it could mean something else. He thought the President was put in a position at times where he/she might have to respond to a question by virtue of being the Chief Executive Officer of the institution. His perception of this statement was that if that individual responds while clarifying that he/she is speaking as President, but not on behalf of the entire University, there is a difference. If the President spoke as President, it is different than the President speaking on behalf of the University community or the faculty. There is a latitude where the President could speak as an individual such as a letter to the editor, and speaking as Chief Executive Officer of the University.

Mr. Mottram asked if the Senate didn't operate under the same principle as the President. Mr. Strand said, Yes.

Mr. White was trying to understand the wording of the document. What was the document was prohibiting us from doing. If it was prohibiting us from speaking for the institution, he agreed with the document. If it was prohibiting us from speaking as a Senate, he disagreed with the document.

Mr. Zeidenstein said there were three roles: common citizen, President, but not speaking for the institution, and President speaking on behalf of the institution. "Partisan Issue" is defined in the bottom paragraph of the Statement: "the Academic Senate defines a 'partisan issue' as a subject of political, social, religious, or similar import on which the members of society outside the University are in serious disagreement or polarized and are in the process of resolving the issue through regular democratic channels;....."

Mr. Youngs stated that he was on the Senate at the time it was originally debated. He was sufficiently impressed with it that he recalled the debate. He had discussed it with Mary Kay Huser who had served on the committee that developed it. What he was impressed with at the time was the position of the Senate that the University not become politically aligned with one movement or another, the purpose being to allow free discourse and discussion within the University. He thought that position continued to be relevant today.

Mr. Klass thought that senators with institutional memory could give examples of why this was passed in the first place. What was the history involved. Is Curtis White's resolution coming before the Senate at this time?

Mr. Schmaltz said the Senate was not debating the wisdom of this policy. The issue before the Senate was information on the Zeidenstein amendment as presented by the Rules Committee. If a senator wished to reconsider the entire policy, it would have to be presented to the Rules Committee. Mr. White's resolution was not on the Agenda. If the Rules Committee wished to bring this, they could do so.

Mr. Borg asked for clarification on the original statement concerning "faculty body" in the last paragraph. Was the Senate to be defined as a "faculty body". There are student members on the Senate.

Mr. Cohen stated that two of the six authors of the position statement were students.

Mr. Meiron had spoken with a person who was a student member on the Senate at the time it was passed. Paragraph 7 stated: "Because accepted academic practice does not permit either students or faculty members to use their classes for the teaching or discussion of controversial matter that has no relation to the subject matter of the course." The students at that time were trying to pass resolutions such as: "Put an end to the Viet Nam war." Issues such as this had no relation to the Academic Senate.

Mr. Zeidenstein interpreted the seventh paragraph as setting a context, not a direct one-to-one relationship to the Academic Senate. The "Be it resolved" paragraph falls is consistent with some of the earlier paragraphs. He thought it had a broader context.

Mr. Gamsky stated that he was on the Senate at that time. There were numerous controversial issues at that time in the late sixties and early seventies. There were demonstrations in the room while the Senate was trying to conduct business. Virtually at every Senate meeting there was a tremendous amount of pressure and disruption. In the context of this, the Senate wanted to disassociate itself from political issues. The Senate felt that in order to deal with the logical business of the University it would not get involved in political issues.

Mr. Cohen stated that the committee that developed this policy was an appointed committee. James McBee was the Chairperson of Agriculture; Mary K. Huser was not a member of the Senate at the time, and Dale Vetter was a Professor of English. He did not recall that any of these members of the committee were members of the Senate. It was a document written by a special committee and brought back to the Senate to resolve these issues.

Mr. White thought the problem with the document was that it was obscure. It seemed to him that the Rules Committee could make a clarification and bring it back to the Senate. He wished to move that the document be returned to the Rules Committee for clarification.

The Chair stated that this was an Information Item at this time. The Parliamentarian had pointed out that there was no motion on the floor at the time, so it could not be referred to committee. Under Communications, a Sense of the Resolution could be introduced.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that the original statement was not part of tonight's information item.

Mr. Klass was in favor of Senator White's proposal. He asked if it would be in order at the next meeting to propose Senator White's proposal as a substitute motion. Mr. Cohen said a substitute motion was always in order, once a motion is on the floor, a motion to amend can do anything you want.

Mr. White asked if this would be an action item at the next meeting.

Mr. Schmaltz stated that the Executive Committee sets the Agenda for the meeting, and it would be an action item if the committee decided to put it on the Agenda.

Mr. Belknap said that the Rules Committee would request this at the next Executive Committee. He wanted to make it clear to the Senate that in Mr. White's 7.1.87.1 communication to the Senate, first paragraph, he asked that the "Rules Committee advise the senate to rescind the 1972 Statement on the Politicization of the University." The Rules Committee voted against this.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if this would be an action item only if the Rules Committee met again and acted again on this issue. Mr. Schmaltz stated that usually the Rules Committee Chair would communicate his desire for the item to move forward to action item. The Chair of a committee could stop an item from being presented as an action item.

Communications

None.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Ms. Mills called a brief meeting following Senate.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Mr. Borg called a meeting after Senate.

Budget Committee - Mr. DeLong asked his committee members to meet after Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Mr. O'Rourke had no report.

Rules Committee - Mr. Belknap called a short meeting with the intent of scheduling another meeting.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

XVIV-6 Mr. Meiron moved to adjourn (Second, Cummings). Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUDITH A. ROOF, SECRETARY

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE						VOICE VOTE		
		MOTION # XVIV-4	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	Y	N
FRON	P	NO						XVIV-1	X	
WINGFIELD	excused	-						XVIV-2	X	
BELKNAP	P	YES						XVIV-3		WITHDRAWN
BORG	P	NO						XVIV-4		X
CASTLE	P	YES						XVIV-5	X	
COMADENA	P	NO						XVIV-6	X	
CUMMINGS	P	YES								
DELONG	P	NO								
EDWARDS	P	YES								
EICHSTAEDT	absent	-								
FEASTER	P	NO								
GAMSKY	P	YES								
HAMILTON	P	YES								
HARDEN	P	YES								
INSEL	P	YES								
JOHNSON	P	YES								
KING	excused	-								
KIRCHNER	P	NO								
KLASS	P	NO								
KRISTOF	P	YES								
LIEDTKE	P	NO								
MC CARTHY	P	NO								
MEIRON	P	YES								
MILLS	P	YES								
MORREAU	P	NO								
OTRAM	P	NO								
REWBY	P	NO								
NOLAN	excused	-								
O'ROURKE	P	YES								
PETERS	P	YES								
PETROSSIAN	excused	-								
POWELL	P	NO								
ROOF	P	YES								
SCHMALTZ	P	YES								
SHULMAN	P	YES								
STRAND	P	YES								
SUTTON	P	YES								
TAYLOR	P	YES								
THOMAS	P	YES								
VAN MEIGHEN	P	YES								
YOUNGS	P	NO								
WAGNER	P	YES								
WATKINS	excused	-								
WHITE	P	NO								
WILLIAMS	P	YES								
WOJAHN	P	YES								
WOOD	P	NO								
ZEIDENSTEIN	P	NO								
ZINNEN	P	YES								
		26 YES								
		17 NO								
		(NOT 2/3 MAJORITY) MOTION FAILED								

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

August 26, 1987

Volume XVIV, No. 1

CONTENTS

Call to Order

Seating of New Senators

Roll Call

Minutes of July 15, 1987

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

- ACTION ITEMS:
1. Election of New Vice Chairperson
Scott J. Williams
 2. Approval of Student Appointments to Honors Council
 3. Approval of A/P Representative to Economic Well
Being Committee

INFORMATION ITEM: Rules Committee Recommendation on Statement of
Politicization

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not approved by the Academic Senate.)

August 26, 1987

Volume XVIV, No. 1

Call to Order

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

Seating of New Senators

Mr. Schmaltz introduced three new Academic Senators. John McCarthy from Educational Administration and Foundations will be replacing Ken Strand who is on sabbatical. Ed Kristof, a Junior Social Sciences Teacher Education major, would be replacing David Breuer who was resigning. Charles Sutton, the new Student Regent, a Senior Business & Finance major, would also be joining the Senate.

Roll Call

Secretary Roof called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Minutes of July 15, 1987

Mr. Shulman had a correction on Page 5, third paragraph should read: "15% and 25% reductions,".

Mr. Belknap moved to approve the Minutes of July 15, 1987 as corrected (Second, Borg). Motion carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Schmaltz announced that the President had an excused absence this evening. He read from a letter written by President Watkins: "By this letter I am officially notifying the Senate that there is a vacancy in the position of Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction. Would you please share this information with the Senate on August 26, so that the search process may begin."

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Breuer announced that applications for students on external committees were lacking. Therefore, he urged senators, both faculty and students, and administrators to try to recruit students for these positions. The deadline is Friday, August 28th. Applications can be picked up in the Academic Senate Office. He announced that he was resigning as a Senator and Vice Chairperson due to the fact that he would not be in school this semester.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Meiron had no remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

Provost David Strand addressed three topics. His first topic concerned the Search Committee for the position of Assistant Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Instruction. He had asked Dr. Ann Nolte, a member of the Administrative Selection Committee Chairperson Panel (Panel of Ten) to serve as Chair of the Search Committee and Dr. Virginia Owen, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, to serve as Secretary of this Committee. He had communicated this information to Chairperson Schmaltz with a copy of the University Procedure that will now go into place to select the other committee members. He read from this University Procedure for Administrator Selection for Other than College Dean or Department Head: "After the chairperson and secretary have been appointed, the remaining three faculty members shall be elected from a constituency identified by the Administrative Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate in consultation with the Provost." In regard to student representation, "the Academic Senate will elect two students to serve on the committee." Finally, "The Provost may determine that up to two additional members may be added to the committee. The method of selection of such members shall be determined by the Academic Senate upon the recommendation of the Provost." At times a given college has not been represented on the committee, and this allows leeway to choose another faculty representative to even out the distribution. This alternative is also used in placing protected class persons on the committee. The Senate will elect three faculty members and two students, hopefully during the September meetings.

Secondly, he spoke to the issue of Oral English Language Proficiency. At the July meeting of the Senate there was some discussion about some elements of that report, and he had indicated that members of the Senate could raise questions or concerns to him. The document would not be reopened or reconsidered, but expressions of concern were welcomed by the Provost's Office. He had heard from two senators. They asked about Appendix C and some of the language contained in it. Mr. Strand had contacted the Chair of the Committee, Dean Elizabeth Chapman, and she had indicated that the Appendix items were not policy statements, they were included as an historical record for the committee proceedings. Therefore, since they do not have any direct relationship to the policy statement itself, all appendices are being dropped from the report. The report now would consist of the two-page Executive Summary and the five-page report. Another question raised was whether or not the University Review Committee should in fact review this statement for possible approval or possible referencing. It is our feeling that this policy was externally mandated and fits into the category of the affirmative action statement, the equal opportunity statement, the immigration I-9 verification process, and none of these were brought to the attention of the URC. It was their feeling that this report which conforms to a state law does not need to go to the University Review Committee. The responsibility for implementing the oral English proficiency requirement is that of the department chairperson in the role of manager or supervisor of faculty in his department. It is not a charge given to the DFSC. The complaint aspect of the oral English proficiency statement is outside the ASPT process, so that is another reason not to refer this to the University Review Committee.

The third topic is the budget recision and its effect on the academic area. A Provost Office Newsletter distributed today explains this in detail. To briefly summarize what was done, in July when it became apparent that

there was going to be a budget recision, each of the Deans and other administrators in the Provost's area was asked to engage in exercises to reduce the budget from last year by three, four, or five per cent. We found out then that the budget for this year at the University was going to be \$1,568,900 less than the FY 87 budget, in terms of appropriated funds. Since 75% of the appropriated budget is in the academic area, the recision for the academic area amounted to \$1,040,000. At that point we asked the Deans to engage in a 4% reduction exercise to finalize their preliminary work, and submit to the Provost's Office a 4% reduction package. The parameters for determining the final list of budget cuts were four-fold:

1. University and College priorities would be acknowledged, respected and protected as best we could.
2. The impact of the cuts on the fall semester would be minimized.
3. Budget reductions would be applied on a case-by-case basis; with no "across-the-board" cuts being considered.
4. Personal services dollars for summer session salaries of faculty would not be reduced.

We went through this exercise with Dr. Anita Webb-Lupo and Dr. Ed Anderson of the Provost's Office. The cuts ranged from 1% to 10.2% by administrative unit. The heaviest cuts came in the Provost's Office administrative areas, and no college budget was cut more than 4%. As indicated in the newsletter, the Board of Regents at its September meeting is supposed to address the recision problem, and we are hopeful that there will be some sort of exclusion which will probably impact upon students. The students may encounter an unexpected, mid-year tuition increase. We hope that there are other alternatives that can be pursued. It is important that we do something to address the recision, because most of the cuts that we have taken will have a very detrimental impact on the spring semester or summer session offerings of the University.

Mr. Klass asked about the Oral English Language Proficiency report. The Provost stated that this document was externally mandated. He understood that when the Board of Regents voted on the document that the appendices were attached. Since it was externally mandated, he wondered by what authority the appendectomy was conducted. Since the University Review Committee had been excluded, would the Provost also rule that the Academic Affairs Committee could not review this document.

Mr. Strand stated that the state law that required us to have an Oral English Proficiency policy is such that the policy itself is contained in the statement of the Committee and not in the appendices. By deleting the appendices, we are not in any way changing what the Board of Regents approved. The Board of Regents did not approve the appendices. The appendices were provided as supplemental background information, and therefore disassociating the appendices from the body of the report does not in any way change what the Board of Regents did. In regard to whether or not another committee can examine the document itself, a communique from you was referred by the Executive Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee regarding this issue. The Academic Affairs Committee could explore with the Provost's Office the implementation of this policy, might ask the Provost's Office to report at the end of each year on the results of the implementation, may wish to explore with us how the committee reached certain decisions. Opportunities for dialogue still exist.

Mr. Klass asked if this request concerning position announcements was outside the jurisdiction of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Strand stated that he was not a member of the Academic Affairs Committee. When the Executive Committee refers a communique or inquiry to a committee, we are in a different arena for discussion. Mr. Klass said that a judgment had been made previously about the purview of the University Review Committee, was such a judgment to be made about the Academic Affairs Committee? Mr. Strand answered, No.

Mr. Zeidenstein commended the Provost and others who had deleted the Appendices. "No one ever got hurt by having fewer words on paper."

Vice President for Student Affairs, Neal Gamsky, had no remarks.

Vice President for Business and Finance, Warren Harden, had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Election of New Vice Chairperson of the Academic Senate

- XVIV-2 Mr. Meiron nominated Scott Williams.
- XVIV-3 Mr. Powell nominated Marc Feaster from the floor.
- A few senators expressed wishes to have the candidates introduced.
- Mr. Feaster asked to speak.
- Mr. Shulman said this would be construed as campaigning on the Senate floor.
- Mr. Schmaltz said that tradition dictates that the Vice Chairperson be a student.
- XVIV-4 Mr. Meiron moved the previous question. (Second, Shulman).
- Mr. Schmaltz stated this would require a 2/3 vote of all members present, and would cut off debate.
- A roll call vote, 26 in favor, 17 opposed, failed to reach the 2/3 majority. Motion failed.
- Mr. O'Rourke suggested the candidates give a statement of their name, department, and major, and year in school.
- Mr. Zeidenstein suggested each candidate give a short statement about what they stand for.
- Mr. Shulman thought this would be setting a very bad precedent. He thought the candidates should have been chosen at the caucus before the Senate meeting, not at the last minute. There was no reason for a contest on the Senate floor. He was concerned about setting a precedent by having a popularity contest on the Senate floor.
- Mr. Gamsky said the normal process was to hold a caucus which chose a nominee for the position. He wondered if the students had not held such a caucus.
- Mr. Breuer stated that the students had held a caucus. There were three elections; which tied twice. There was not a full representation of students at this caucus.

Mr. Schmaltz called a ten-minute recess.

Mr. Feaster withdrew his name from nomination.

Vote on Scott Williams as Vice Chairperson of the Senate was unanimous.

2. Approval of Student Appointments to Honors Council

XVIV-5 Motion by Newby (Second, Meiron) to approve the nominations of students to the Honors Council, carried on a voice vote.

Laurie Shirck
Janet Storbeck
Deniel Horn
Mark Ludy
Matthew Farney
Sherri Roos

3. Approval of A/P Representative to the Economic Well Being Committee

XVIV-6 Senate unanimously ratified the appointment of Judy Fish to serve on the Economic Well Being Committee as A/P Representative.

INFORMATION ITEM

1. Rules Committee Recommendation on Statement of Politicization

Mr. Belknap, Chairperson of Rules Committee, introduced the recommendation of his committee on the Statement of Politicization. "The Committee decided that the Zeidenstein revised University Politicization Statement (4.30.87.1) is in agreement with University policies as stated in Articles II and III of the I.S.U. Constitution." The changes included: (1) changing the word politicization to "politicizing the University"; and (2) adding the following new paragraph to the end of the statement: "This resolution need not preclude the taking of institutional positions on issues of public policy which--although narrowly construed--still clearly and directly threaten undesirable changes in the internal operations and policies, budgetary priorities, or academic and other standards and practices of Illinois State University."

Mr. Comadena questioned the Rules Committee Minutes of June 22, 1987, the vote indicated 4 in favor, 1 in opposition, one absent, and one abstaining, which did not add up to the members present at the meeting. Ms. Wojahn, Secretary for the Committee, said at the time of the vote one person had left the meeting. The vote should have included two absent.

Mr. White asked about the meaning of the phrase "institutional position". Could the Senate take a position which is an "institutional position"-- or is it possible for the Senate to take a position which is the Senate's position. If it is possible for the Senate to take a position which is only the Senate's position, then he suggested that the whole document made no sense. He would like an interpretation of what "institutional position" means. This was contained in the Statement on Politicization, last paragraph: "Be it resolved (1) that no representative faculty member, faculty body, officer, or agent of Illinois State University shall take an institutional position on any partisan issue....."

Mr. Belknap stated that one or more than one person could be speaking on behalf of the institution.

Mr. Zeidenstein said if the statements made by the Academic Senate did not constitute "institutional positions", then there are no such things. This is a representative body of the institution Illinois State University. It was clear to him that positions taken by the Academic Senate are statements in which representatives of the University speak for the institution which they represent--which constitutes an "institutional position".

Mr. Shulman thought the President of the University had to approve the actions of the Academic Senate. The chief academic officer of this University is the Provost, not the Senate.

Mr. Schmaltz said that the President of the University does not approve or disapprove of a Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Mr. Shulman said the President does approve "action" by the Academic Senate. He cited communication 7.22.87.1 in the Executive Committee Minutes of 8/19/87 which indicated the President's approval of Academic Senate Action.

Mr. Schmaltz said there is a difference between action items and a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Several years ago when the Senate passed a resolution involving Market Equity and related issues, as a Sense of the Senate Resolution, the President was informed of that. It expressed the will of the majority of the Senate, but, in essence, it goes no where. The President did not approve or disapprove it.

Mr. Zeidenstein did not want his earlier remarks misconstrued as meaning that the Academic Senate was the exclusive spokesperson of the University. Obviously, there is more than one official spokesperson or spokesperson for this institution. The President is clearly one; the Provost is clearly another; and its proper area, the Academic Senate would be a third. The "institutional position" is defined in the last three and a half lines of the 1972 statement: ".....the Academic Senate defines "institutional position" as one on which the University as a community of scholars is represented as having reached a decision for the purpose of influencing society in the resolution of the issue that has polarized it." Any resolution adopted by the Academic Senate would be construed as a decision which represents the entire University community.

Mr. White asked if this statement forbade the President of the University from taking positions on political matters.

Mr. Belknap said if the President of the University were considered as an officer or agent of the institution, then he would presume so. Yes.

Mr. Zeidenstein said that if the President were to speak out as President of the University, he would be included in this statement. If he as a person were to write a letter to the editor, he could speak out in his own right, as other faculty members express their opinions. The distinction is that the President of this University, and any member of this University, faculty, staff, and student has every constitutional first amendment right to say and speak about anything that person wishes. When it comes to the place where one is speaking as if one's personal views represent an entire institution, it is a different matter. He would object to having the President speak in behalf of the institution in a political manner, and indicate that it was an institutional position.

Mr. Strand did not wish to speak for the President, but he felt clarification was needed. What is meant by "partisan issue"? Partisan issue is not defined, so we don't know exactly what we are talking about. If we are talking about democrats vs. republicans, that is one thing, but if we are talking about something in a broader context, it could mean something else. He thought the President was put in a position at times where he/she might have to respond to a question by virtue of being the Chief Executive Officer of the institution. His perception of this statement was that if that individual responds while clarifying that he/she is speaking as President, but not on behalf of the entire University, there is a difference. If the President spoke as President, it is different than the President speaking on behalf of the University community or the faculty. There is a latitude where the President could speak as an individual such as a letter to the editor, and speaking as Chief Executive Officer of the University.

Mr. Mottram asked if the Senate didn't operate under the same principle as the President. Mr. Strand said, Yes.

Mr. White was trying to understand the wording of the document. What was the document was prohibiting us from doing. If it was prohibiting us from speaking for the institution, he agreed with the document. If it was prohibiting us from speaking as a Senate, he disagreed with the document.

Mr. Zeidenstein said there were three roles: common citizen, President, but not speaking for the institution, and President speaking on behalf of the institution. "Partisan Issue" is defined in the bottom paragraph of the Statement: "the Academic Senate defines a 'partisan issue' as a subject of political, social, religious, or similar import on which the members of society outside the University are in serious disagreement or polarized and are in the process of resolving the issue through regular democratic channels;....."

Mr. Youngs stated that he was on the Senate at the time it was originally debated. He was sufficiently impressed with it that he recalled the debate. He had discussed it with Mary Kay Huser who had served on the committee that developed it. What he was impressed with at the time was the position of the Senate that the University not become politically aligned with one movement or another, the purpose being to allow free discourse and discussion within the University. He thought that position continued to be relevant today.

Mr. Klass thought that senators with institutional memory could give examples of why this was passed in the first place. What was the history involved. Is Curtis White's resolution coming before the Senate at this time?

Mr. Schmaltz said the Senate was not debating the wisdom of this policy. The issue before the Senate was information on the Zeidenstein amendment as presented by the Rules Committee. If a senator wished to reconsider the entire policy, it would have to be presented to the Rules Committee. Mr. White's resolution was not on the Agenda. If the Rules Committee wished to bring this, they could do so.

Mr. Borg asked for clarification on the original statement concerning "faculty body" in the last paragraph. Was the Senate to be defined as a "faculty body". There are student members on the Senate.

Mr. Cohen stated that two of the six authors of the position statement were students.

Mr. Meiron had spoken with a person who was a student member on the Senate at the time it was passed. Paragraph 7 stated: "Because accepted academic practice does not permit either students or faculty members to use their classes for the teaching or discussion of controversial matter that has no relation to the subject matter of the course." The students at that time were trying to pass resolutions such as: "Put an end to the Viet Nam war." Issues such as this had no relation to the Academic Senate.

Mr. Zeidenstein interpreted the seventh paragraph as setting a context, not a direct one-to-one relationship to the Academic Senate. The "Be it resolved" paragraph falls is consistent with some of the earlier paragraphs. He thought it had a broader context.

Mr. Gamsky stated that he was on the Senate at that time. There were numerous controversial issues at that time in the late sixties and early seventies. There were demonstrations in the room while the Senate was trying to conduct business. Virtually at every Senate meeting there was a tremendous amount of pressure and disruption. In the context of this, the Senate wanted to disassociate itself from political issues. The Senate felt that in order to deal with the logical business of the University it would not get involved in political issues.

Mr. Cohen stated that the committee that developed this policy was an appointed committee. James McBee was the Chairperson of Agriculture; Mary K. Huser was not a member of the Senate at the time, and Dale Vetter was a Professor of English. He did not recall that any of these members of the committee were members of the Senate. It was a document written by a special committee and brought back to the Senate to resolve these issues.

Mr. White thought the problem with the document was that it was obscure. It seemed to him that the Rules Committee could make a clarification and bring it back to the Senate. He wished to move that the document be returned to the Rules Committee for clarification.

The Chair stated that this was an Information Item at this time. The Parliamentarian had pointed out that there was no motion on the floor at the time, so it could not be referred to committee. Under Communications, a Sense of the Resolution could be introduced.

Mr. Zeidenstein stated that the original statement was not part of tonight's information item.

Mr. Klass was in favor of Senator White's proposal. He asked if it would be in order at the next meeting to propose Senator White's proposal as a substitute motion. Mr. Cohen said a substitute motion was always in order, once a motion is on the floor, a motion to amend can do anything you want.

Mr. White asked if this would be an action item at the next meeting.

Mr. Schmaltz stated that the Executive Committee sets the Agenda for the meeting, and it would be an action item if the committee decided to put it on the Agenda.

Mr. Belknap said that the Rules Committee would request this at the next Executive Committee. He wanted to make it clear to the Senate that in Mr. White's 7.1.87.1 communication to the Senate, first paragraph, he asked that the "Rules Committee advise the senate to rescind the 1972 Statement on the Politicization of the University." The Rules Committee voted against this.

Mr. Zeidenstein asked if this would be an action item only if the Rules Committee met again and acted again on this issue. Mr. Schmaltz stated that usually the Rules Committee Chair would communicate his desire for the item to move forward to action item. The Chair of a committee could stop an item from being presented as an action item.

Communications

None.

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Ms. Mills called a brief meeting following Senate.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Mr. Borg called a meeting after Senate.

Budget Committee - Mr. DeLong asked his committee members to meet after Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Mr. O'Rourke had no report.

Rules Committee - Mr. Belknap called a short meeting with the intent of scheduling another meeting.

Student Affairs Committee - No report.

XVIV-6 Mr. Meiron moved to adjourn (Second, Cummings). Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE

JUDITH A. ROOF, SECRETARY

NAME	ATTEN- DANCE	VOTE						VOICE VOTE		
		MOTION # XVIV-4	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	MOTION #	Y	N
BARON	P	NO						XVIV-1	X	
BINGFIELD	excused	-						XVIV-2	X	
BELKNAP	P	YES						XVIV-3		WITHDRAWN
BORG	P	NO						XVIV-4		X
CASTLE	P	YES						XVIV-5	X	
COMADENA	P	NO						XVIV-6	X	
CUMMINGS	P	YES								
DELONG	P	NO								
EDWARDS	P	YES								
EICHSTAEDT	absent	-								
FEASTER	P	NO								
GAMSKY	P	YES								
HAMILTON	P	YES								
HARDEN	P	YES								
INSEL	P	YES								
JOHNSON	P	YES								
KING	excused	-								
KIRCHNER	P	NO								
KLASS	P	NO								
KRISTOF	P	YES								
LIEDTKE	P	NO								
MC CARTHY	P	NO								
MEIRON	P	YES								
MILLS	P	YES								
MORREAU	P	NO								
OTTRAM	P	NO								
OWBY	P	NO								
NOLAN	excused	-								
O'ROURKE	P	YES								
PETERS	P	YES								
PETROSSIAN	excused	-								
POWELL	P	NO								
ROOF	P	YES								
SCHMALTZ	P	YES								
SHULMAN	P	YES								
STRAND	P	YES								
SUTTON	P	YES								
TAYLOR	P	YES								
THOMAS	P	YES								
VAN MEIGHEN	P	YES								
YOUNGS	P	NO								
WAGNER	P	YES								
WATKINS	excused	-								
WHITE	P	NO								
WILLIAMS	P	YES								
WOJAHN	P	YES								
WOOD	P	NO								
ZEIDENSTEIN	P	NO								
ZINNEN	P	YES								
		26 YES								
		17 NO								
		(NOT 2/3 MAJORITY) MOTION FAILED								